

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

AMY ROTH, SHANA EKIN, as  
individuals and on behalf of themselves  
and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CHA HOLLYWOOD MEDICAL  
CENTER, L.P., d/b/a CHA Hollywood  
Presbyterian Medical Center and  
Hollywood Presbyterian Medical Center,  
and CHS HEALTHCARE  
MANAGEMENT, L.L.C.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:12-cv-07559-ODW (SHx)

**ORDER STRIKING PLAINTIFFS'  
REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION  
TO REMAND [38]**

On August 26, 2013, Plaintiffs Amy Roth and Shana Ekin filed their Reply in Support of Plaintiff's [*sic*] Motion to Remand. (ECF No. 38.) The Reply swells to some 24 pages—double this Court's reply page limit. FAQs about Judges' Procedures and Schedules ¶ VII(A)(1), *available at* <http://court.cacd.uscourts.gov/CACD/JudgeReq.nsf/2fb080863c88ab47882567c9007fa070/d7596199bbd33e87882579f5006b0828?OpenDocument> ¶ VII.A.3 ("Replies shall not exceed 12 pages.")

Plaintiffs further violate Local Rule 5-4.3.1, which provides,

Documents filed electronically must be submitted in PDF. Except as

1 provided elsewhere in this L.R. 5-4, the document filed with the Court  
2 must be created using word-processing software, then published to PDF  
3 from the original word-processing file (to permit the electronic version of  
4 the document to be searched). PDF IMAGES CREATED BY  
5 SCANNING PAPER DOCUMENTS ARE PROHIBITED . . . .

6 Plaintiffs' Reply appears to be either a scanned document or a nonsearchable PDF. In  
7 either case, the document does not comport with Local Rule 5-4.3.1.

8 Considering both of these rule violations, the Court **STRIKES** Plaintiffs' Reply  
9 (ECF No. 38) and all supporting documents (ECF Nos. 38-1–38-7). *See* L.R. 83-7(c).

10  
11 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

12  
13 August 26, 2013

14  
15   
16 \_\_\_\_\_  
17 **OTIS D. WRIGHT, II**  
18 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28